

(Mr. HASTINGS) the chairman of the ethics committee, for his efforts to resolve the regrettable impasse that has prevented the committee from organizing. He has made a thoughtful and good-faith attempt to clear up any misunderstanding and resolve any perceived concerns.

But this was rejected out of hand by our friends on the other side of the aisle. Why? Because their concerns are neither real nor substantive. They want the committee to be in limbo. They are creating an issue for political purposes without any positive ideas about how to resolve the very serious challenges facing our Nation. Negativity and political attacks are their only strategy.

Mr. Speaker, this is wrong. Let us move forward constructively and stop abusing our ethics process for purely political gain.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

REMEMBERING EARTH DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the 35th anniversary of the first Earth Day, which is considered the birth of the modern environmental movement in this country. In the 3½ decades since, it was first celebrated in 1970, Earth Day has become a day for reflection, a day for education, and a day for action. It provides an annual benchmark by which we can measure our progress as stewards of our planet.

That stewardship is about more than preserving pristine wilderness and endangered species. Our economic and national security are also at stake. The biggest impediment to sound environmental policies in the United States comes from those who see environmentalism as competing with our economic prosperity and our national security.

The energy bill that was just considered by the House was advertised by its supporters as providing security for America by reducing our dependence on foreign sources of fossil fuels. It does this through \$8 billion in tax breaks to encourage domestic production.

Unfortunately, 95 percent of the tax subsidies benefit the oil, gas, coal and nuclear industries, while only 5 percent are directed towards wind, solar and other renewable sources. In my opinion, the energy bill is a short-sighted response to two of the central strategic challenges confronting our country, beginning the transition to a post-fossil-fuel economy and reducing the emission of greenhouse gases that every

reputable scientist knows are contributing to global warming.

We cannot drill our way to energy independence. We cannot burn our way to a cleaner environment. We cannot go on behaving as if time and resources are on our side.

Rather than making America more secure, the energy bill does the opposite. Both economically and in terms of our national security, the policies enshrined in this bill will make us profoundly weaker.

In doing so, we have shied away from the challenge of developing new ways of powering our lives by unleashing the driving force behind America economic competitiveness, technological innovation mixed with entrepreneurship.

□ 1700

And while America sits on the sidelines, our competitors in Europe and Asia are developing technologies that will enable them to reduce fuel consumption and lower emissions of greenhouse gases. Rather than American entrepreneurs driving these changes, it is our competitors who prosper.

In just one graphic example, there are 6-month waiting lists to buy Japanese hybrids while American car makers fall further and further behind.

In addition to environmental and economic considerations, there are equally compelling national security reasons to confront the scarcity and costs of oil, the challenge of global warming and environmental degradation. Imagine the increased strength, independence, and security that would come to an America that could tell the oil-producing nations, we do not need your oil, we do not want your oil, we can do better. And imagine the risk to America if we negligent the sobering evidence of global warming.

Last year the Pentagon's Office of Net Assessment issued a report on the national security aspects of climate change. The report evaluated one scenario in which the Earth's climate rose by 5 degrees in North America over a 15-year period between 2005 and 2020. The consequences of such a rapid temperature increase were myriad and catastrophic: drought, fire, storms and sea levels that rose around the world, flooding heavily populated coastal regions.

Unfortunately, the administration has failed to provide leadership or vision on this issue. Senior level positions at the National Security Council and in the Department of Defense dealing with the security threat of environmental degradation have been downgraded or eliminated. From the President on down, this administration has had a contempt for science that is at odds with its policy or belief.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at a time when this Nation should be marshaling its talents and resources for a new Manhattan Project to make practical solar, wind, and wave energy, we have instead opted to subsidize the extraction of every last barrel of oil and ton of coal that we can get our hands on.

Even as we have driven up the financial burden on our children through reckless fiscal policies, we are imperiling their very existence through willful neglect of our responsibilities to the environment. I can only hope that we will not have to tell our grandchildren, to paraphrase the words of Kurt Vonnegut, We could have saved the Earth, but we were too darned cheap.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 6, ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 6, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

IN SUPPORT OF LT. ILARIO PANTANO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken at length on the floor about Second Lt. Ilario Pantano, a Marine who served this Nation bravely in both gulf wars.

During his service in Iraq last year, Lt. Pantano was faced with a very difficult decision that caused him to make a split-second decision to defend his life. He felt threatened by the actions of two insurgents under his watch, and in an act of self-defense he had to resort to force. Two and a half months later, a sergeant under his command who never even saw the shooting accused him of murder. Lt. Pantano now faces two counts of murder.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening to this young man is an injustice. Lt. Pantano has served this Nation in great honor. My personal experiences with him and his family convince me that he is a dedicated family man and a man who loves his corps and his country; but I am not the only one who believes he is innocent.

I have read excerpts of pieces from the Washington Times and respected journalist Mona Charen defending Lt. Pantano. I have received letters and e-mails from Vietnam veterans who sympathize with him and ask that I do something to help him. They know what it is like to be in a battle with an unconventional enemy. One second can make the difference between life and death.

I have read excerpts from his fitness report in which his superiors praise his leadership and talent. In that report, his superior officer evaluated "accomplished infantry leader. His actions during the fighting in Fallujah and Al Zaidon highlighted a solid understanding of tactics and ability to anticipate the enemy. Leads from the front always and balances his aggressive style with true concern for the welfare of his Marines. Exceptional communication skills for a Second Lt. Organized, aggressive, focused and driven. Ready for increased responsibility. Retain, promote, and assign to challenging assignments."

Mr. Speaker, that came 2 months after the sergeant reported him for murder.

Mr. Speaker, Lt. Pantano by all accounts is an exceptional Marine. On Monday, April 25, there will be an Article 32 hearing to determine whether or not Lt. Pantano will face a court-martial for a murder trial. If convicted by a court-martial, Lt. Pantano can be subject to the death penalty for an action he took in self-defense on the battlefield.

I hope and pray, Mr. Speaker, that on Monday Lt. Pantano will be cleared of all charges because I am confident that he did his duty as any Marine officer should when faced with the enemy.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Resolution 167 to support Lt. Pantano as he faces trial. I hope that my colleagues in the House will take some time to read my resolution and look into this situation for themselves. Lt. Pantano's mother, a wonderful lady whom I have spoken to by telephone on several occasions, also has a Web site that I encourage people to visit. The address is www.defendthedefenders.org.

Mr. Speaker, I close by asking the Good Lord to please bless our men and women in uniform and their families and to please be with Lt. Pantano on Monday, April 25 and may he be exonerated of these charges for doing his duty to protect America. God bless him and God bless America.

SMART ENERGY POLICIES, NATIONAL SECURITY, AND IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6, which the House passed earlier today, is called the Energy Policy Act of 2005. But the only real policies to be found in this immoral legislation are tax breaks for polluters, swollen gasoline prices, and continued reliance on fossil fuels of the past. This legislation fails to even mention climate change or global warming which scientists of all stripes acknowledge is caused at least in part by high levels of carbon dioxide emissions from automobiles.

It fails to correct the matter of MTBE, a gasoline additive that has leaked into the Earth and tarnished our drinking water, except, however, to waive liabilities for MTBE providers.

Most significant of all, Mr. Speaker, this legislation fails to truly address America's reliance on Middle East oil. Of the 21 million barrels consumed by the United States each day, 14 million barrels are imported, making Middle East oil the United States' main source of energy. Much of this oil is imported from countries that do not share America's commitment to democracy and our commitment to human rights, countries like Saudi Arabia, Libya, and Venezuela.

It is obvious in this energy bill that those who claim that drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska will cure our Nation's energy policy do not know much about how oil is produced. Drilling in ANWR will do little to reduce our current dependence on foreign oil because it will take a full decade to process what little oil may be there in the first place. That does not sound like a comprehensive energy strategy to me.

By continuing to purchase Middle East oil by the boatload, we are failing to take advantage of life-changing renewable energy technologies while continuing to promote our national insecurity by providing billions of dollars each year to repressive regimes.

The oil dollars that go to oppressive Middle East regimes do not, of course, help the poor people in these countries. Instead, they line the already thick pockets of the fat-cat ruling elite. In this way, U.S. policies actually discourage democracy in the Middle East because we continue to help maintain the economic gap between the rich and the poor.

In truth, this failure to reduce our dependence on Middle East oil along with President Bush's supremely misguided invasion of Iraq have combined to make Americans less secure, not more secure.

The Bush administration has falsely labeled the war in Iraq, much like the latest energy bill, as the essence of protecting our national security, when in fact both contribute to our lack of security.

Already more than 1,500 American soldiers and tens of thousands of Iraqi civilians have been killed in this war, not to mention the more than 12,000 troops who have been gravely wounded. Hardly the stuff of a national security.

Let us never forget that the invasion of Iraq was a war of choice against a country that never posed a threat to the United States and never possessed relationships with international terrorist groups like al Qaeda.

President Bush claims that things are going well in Iraq, demonstrated by the fact that 150,000 Iraqi soldiers "have been adequately trained." But if 150,000 Iraqi soldiers have been trained, then why do 150,000 American soldiers remain in the country? Why do our troops continue to die for a war that was a mistake from the very beginning?

If President Bush continues to support a misguided war that is draining our national resources, and if the Republicans will not work to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, how can they possibly claim to be securing America against the threat of terrorism? Clearly, much more needs to be done to make America secure.

Mr. Speaker, I will soon reintroduce the SMART Security resolution, legislation to secure America for the future by preventing the threat of terrorism; reducing nuclear stock piles; eliminating the possible use of nuclear weapons through diplomatic means; and establishing a new Apollo Project to secure America's energy independence.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in this effort to truly secure America for the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

SERIOUS ENERGY PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DeFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, well, America has a serious problem with energy prices. If you just peruse today's Wall Street Journal and New York Times, you will see the airlines are reporting record losses in great part despite efficiencies, despite concessions